61st Legislative Day

5/25/2007

- Speaker Madigan: "The House shall come to order. The Members shall be in their chairs. We ask the Members and our guests in the gallery to rise and to turn off laptop computers, cell phones, and pagers. And we ask the guests in the gallery to rise and join us for the invocation and the Pledge of Allegiance. We shall be led in prayer today by Wayne Padget, the Assistant Doorkeeper."
- Wayne Padget: "Let us pray. Dear heavenly Father, we come before You today honoring Your life and accomplishments. We pray that You would look over these Representatives and their families. We ask that You would look over the men and women of the Armed Services and we pray for all of them to come home safely. We pray that during these hard times of negotiations that two sides can come together on common ground and help all the people of this great state. These things we ask in Your name. Amen."
- Speaker Madigan: "We shall be led in the Pledge of Allegiance by Representative Moffitt."
- Moffitt et al: "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."
- Speaker Madigan: "Roll Call for Attendance. Representative Currie."
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. Please let the record reflect that Representative Graham and Patterson are excused today."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Bost."
- Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Let the record reflect that all Republicans are present."

61st Legislative Day

5/25/2007

Speaker Madigan: "The Clerk shall take the record. There being 116 Members responding to the Attendance Roll Call, there is a quorum present. Mr. Clerk."

"Committee Reports. Representative D'Amico, Clerk Mahonev: Chairperson from the Committee on Drivers Education & Safety, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on May 25, 2007, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'do pass Short Debate' Senate Bill 1318. Representative Jakobsson, Chairperson from the Committee on Human Services, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on May 25, 2007, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'do pass Short Debate' is Senate Bill 175; 'do pass as amended Short Debate' is Senate Bill 15; 'recommends be adopted Short Debate' is Senate Joint Resolution 26. Representative Gordon, Chairperson from the Committee on Smart Growth & Regional Planning, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on May 25, 2007, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'recommends be adopted' is Floor Amendment #4 to House Bill 1134. Representative Flowers, Chairperson from the Committee on Health Care Availability and Access, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on May 2007, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'recommends be adopted' is Floor Amendment #2 House Bill 119. Representative Chapa LaVia, Chairperson from the Committee on Local Government, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on May 25, 2007, reported the same back with the following

61st Legislative Day

5/25/2007

recommendation/s: 'recommends be adopted' is Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 620. Representative Holbrook, Chairperson from the Committee on Public Utilities, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on May 25, 2007, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'recommends be adopted' is Floor Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 680. Representative Molaro, Chairperson from the Committee on Judiciary II-Criminal Law, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on May 25, 2007, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'recommends be adopted' Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 2755. Representative Franks, Chairperson from the Committee on State Government Administration, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on May 25, 2007, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'do pass Short Debate' is Senate Bill 767; 'recommends be adopted' is Senate Joint Resolution 1, Senate Joint Resolution 3, Senate Joint Resolution 5, Senate Joint Resolution 21, Senate Joint Resolution 30, and Floor Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 753."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Reitz, would you like to call Senate Bill 19? The Gentleman indicates he does not wish to call the Bill. Is Representative Nekritz in the chamber? Nekritz. Mr. Colvin, did you wish to call Senate Bill 124? The Gentleman indicates he does not wish to call the Bill. Representative May, do you wish to call Senate Bill 26? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill, 126."

Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 126, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

61st Legislative Day

5/25/2007

May: "Yes. Thank you, Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This simply allows a twenty-four (24) hour station that transfers yard waste to also be able to grind it, allowing less trucks on the road and... it's... agreed. We don't know of any known opposition."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Hannig in the Chair.

Representative Franks."

Franks: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Hannig: "Indicates she'll yield."

Franks: "Representative, I'm reading the analysis on this and I'm wondering, why do we need this law?"

May: "I think to clarify the situation that they are allowed to grind, because it's a twenty-four (24) hour transfer station."

Franks: "Well, are they allowed to grind now?"

May: "I believe this clarifies that they can grind."

Franks: "Be... our analysis indicates that the Bill would remove the local siting requirement for this because they say currently siting is not required if no grinding occurs. So that means, my understanding, is that siting would be required if they wanted to grind. Would that be your understanding?"

May: "I believe so. Yes."

Franks: "So, here's my question. Why do we want to take away local control?"

May: "Because it is a step that many people already do. I think it's really with the EPA with their siting. The… I think the bottom line is that the… the locals were fine with it, too, but we thought that this was just a good precedent so

61st Legislative Day

5/25/2007

that like... As you're aware, a lot of landscapers already grind right on the street. So this just makes a lot of sense."

Franks: "Okay. Thank you."

May: "Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "The Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Black."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Hannig: "She indicates she'll yield."

Black: "Representative, following up on the previous speaker, why in the world would localities want to give up siting control over a landscape waste transfer station?"

May: "I think it really has to do just with the... with the grinding, just this one step."

Black: "I don't think it has anything to do with that at all.

Have you ever smelled landscape waste?"

May: "It's a... if I could just point out this is a twenty-four (24) hour..."

Black: "I understand that."

May: "...that doesn't change. Yes."

Black: "You know I... Believe it or not, Representative, they taught me how to read several years ago. But I don't know how long the landscape waste has been in the back of the truck. I don't know how long it may have set in the... a landowner's yard. And... and you're... you're telling me, because one landscape waste management company doesn't want to go through a local siting process, that my residents would give up their right to local siting? You know... these...

61st Legislative Day

5/25/2007

these transfer stations could have tons of landscape waste. Not just a truckload, tons. They... they stink. Rodents and little animals come out to feed on the grass and the leaves and the clippings and everything else. I... I fail to understand why... why the loss of local siting control... the only person that could be... that could benefit would be the company that's dumping the landscape waste."

May: "It's still the twenty-four (24) hour. I... You know I understand your point that perhaps you don't know. But most landscapers, these are professional landscape companies, so that it's fresh on their truck. I do understand, but I... I don't think that leaves or twigs or anything like that is a nuisance. It's otherwise I think it would be a different permit."

Black: "Well, thank you very much, Representative."

May: "I mean it's really just the grinding that is the change here."

Black: "Yeah. Thank you very much. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Bill... or to the Assembly, to the Bill. This gives up any ability for locals to site what would be a landscape waste transfer station that could involve several tons of landscape waste, some of which may have already been in the summer sun and doesn't take long for that to give a really nice odor. For those of you who mow your yard and put the landscape waste in either the landscape bags or the toter, whatever your community uses to pick it up, you may us... put the landscape waste in there on a Thursday and it isn't picked up until Monday. You usually don't want to go near the storage container where you have it because it

61st Legislative Day

5/25/2007

doesn't smell very good. And if you don't keep it pretty well protected, you get all kinds of little ground animals and all kinds of pests that like to get into it. And now... now you're talking about no siting control. We can't regulate the traffic. We don't know how many trucks are going to come in and out. We don't know what size trucks they're going to be. We don't know whether it's going to be ten (10) tons of landscape waste or a hundred (100) tons of landscape waste. We don't know if it's going to be wet landscape waste, which then really puts up an odor and this may be in an area where the people don't want it. We... we established local siting control so that people have an avenue to look at the plans, determine what the impact would in their neighborhood, determine what the traffic patterns would be, depending on what the noise would be, depending on the hours of operation that the landscape waste company would be able to dump and retrieve. Sure it's only storage for twenty-four (24) hours, but in that twenty-four (24) hour period, if you have asthma or severe allergies, as my wife does, that would drive her crazy. I... I don't understand why anybody would want to give up local siting control over any kind of transfer station, be it landscape waste or any other. I stand in strong opposition to the Bill. I would urge a 'no' vote. Mr. Speaker, should the Bill get the requisite number for passage, I would seek a verification."

Speaker Hannig: "And you'll be recognized at that time,

Representative. The Lady from Cook, Representative

Mulligan."

61st Legislative Day

5/25/2007

Mulligan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Hannig: "She indicates she'll yield."

Mulligan: "Representative, I'm really surprised that the Senator would've sponsored this Bill. Fifteen (15) years ago this was one of the biggest issues in Des Plaines about a transfer station. We also have an incinerator on themproperty right next to that. And quite frankly, there was a really big issue in Des Plaines. I used to represent part of that area, then it was Representative Krause's and now it's Senator Garrett's and Representative Nekritz. I don't know why anyone would vote for something like this after this was such a big issue in our area about local siting for a transfer station that was over there. And quite frankly, to take away local siting in our area, with such dense population, seems to me to be ill-advised. I certainly wouldn't support your Bill, and I would urge other people particularly from our area not to support it either."

May: "Representative, yes, and I appreciate your concern, but I think that the point to be noted is that existing law already exempts landscape waste transfer stations that do not grind from such local approval. This just allows it from those that do grind, so it is a very, very narrow tiny change. A tiny change that is, in fact, good to reduce the volume that it... before it is transferred."

Mulligan: "Well, particularly since it was such a hot area, and our issue I would think it would be ill-advised for a Legislator that represents that area to have sponsored a Bill such as this. Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Nekritz."

61st Legislative Day

5/25/2007

Nekritz: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Hannig: "She indicates she'll yield."

Nekritz: "Representative May, I apologize, I missed the first part of the discussion. Can you just summarize for me again what... what this legislation would do?"

May: "Yes. For twenty-four (24) hour landscape transfer stations that are already exempt from local sitings if they do not grind, it says that they're exempt if they do grind."

Nekritz: "And what process did they go... do you know what the process they went through to get the exemption if they don't grind?"

May: "If they don't grind... You know what? I'm... I'm not sure, Representative."

Nekritz: "But they have been through a process to get an exemption..."

May: "Yes. Yes. Yes."

Nekritz: "...if they're not grinding. So... so..."

May: "This is just a clarification."

Nekritz: "So the... the surrounding residents and so forth have had an opportunity to at least speak to the desirability or lack thereof of some sort of... some sort of transfer station within their... within their neighborhood or their location..."

May: "Absolutely, I think a local community sites it by zoning and what... and what is allowed. So that they do have control over that and the... quite frankly, this is a great symbiotic relationship. This one particular transfer station that sought this clarification does all of the grinding for the City of Lake Forest also. And they turned it into wonderful

61st Legislative Day

5/25/2007

rich mulch that goes back to serve the parkway. There is no stench; there is nothing involved."

Nekritz: "And... and where is... where is this located?"

May: "It's... it's in Lake Bluff."

Nekritz: "Okay. And is it only one company that's... that's looking to do this?"

May: "The only one that's asked for it. Yes."

Nekritz: "Okay. And... and who is... who... what is the entity that does this that... that... originally did the siting and gave them the exemption? Is it... would it be... is it the Lake County Board or is it the EPA? Do you know who does that?"

May: "Well, I know that the Lake County Board was okay with this."

Nekritz: "Okay."

May: "That they were okay if it wasn't for this question about the grinding."

Nekritz: "Pardon me? I just didn't hear you."

May: "Yes, the EPA was okay with it. They just wanted the clarification on the grinding."

Nekritz: "Okay. So the only thing that's going to be different from the original siting to... to this is the fact that they're going to be doing... going to be doing some grinding?"

May: "Grinding. The grinding which would reduce the volume.

Yes."

Nekritz: "And... and does that make the... the waste more desirable?"

May: "Does it make what... the ...?"

Nekritz: "Does it... does it... Once it's ground, does it make it more desirable? You described some of the..."

61st Legislative Day

5/25/2007

May: "Well, it's actually... it's actually good for business.

It's good for business because it reduces the volume before it's taken to another more permanent station. This is a twenty-four (24) hour transfer station. It would not be sited by any local zoning if it had odors or anything like that."

Nekritz: "Okay. Thank you very much, Representative."

Speaker Hannig: "Is there any further discussion? Then, Representative May, you're recognized to close."

"Yes, thank you. I would just clarify that the only May: exemption, while I appreciate the concerns for everyone about this, the existing law already exempts the landscape waste transfer that do not grind. So, this is a very narrow, narrow thing and... And it... it really is good. would just point out that the wonderful symbiotic relationship that does go on with local government that is supportive of this, they are turning sort of a silk purse into a sow's ear by taking any leaves and twigs and grinding them up, turning them into mulch for the parkways. It is decay organics, which is... would be an example for ... for many people to indeed follow their organic style of turning yard waste into... into mulch and good humus for... for all to use. So while I appreciate the concerns, believe me this is located in an area where the local government deems that it would not be any sort of a nuisance and indeed this one slight, slight change would be something that would reduce the waste, save gas and be good for businesses, be good for businesses to eliminate one step further down the food chain. So I appreciate all of this, but as I say, no one is

61st Legislative Day

5/25/2007

opposed and it's just a clarification for one local business."

Speaker Hannig: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 126 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open.
Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all
voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative
Soto, do you wish to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the
record. On this question, there are 36 voting 'yes' and 78
voting 'no' and the Bill fails. Representative Lang, you
have Senate Bill 144. Out of the record. Representative
May, you have Senate Bill 158. Do you wish us to read that?
Out of the record. Representative Reitz, on Senate Bill
169. Representative Reitz. Representative... Do you wish us
to call 169, Senate Bill? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 169, a Bill for an Act regarding transportation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Reitz."

Reitz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This... this Bill would allow for junior golf to have a... a plate and it also, with the Amendment, would allow collegiate plates for safe colleges outside of the State of Illinois that have at least ten thousand (10,000) alumni in the State of Illinois to also be included in our many, many license plates that we have. And I'd be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Hannig: "This is on the Order of Short Debate. And in response, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative McCarthy."

McCarthy: "Thank you, Mr. Sponsor, will the... or Mr. Chairman...
Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Reitz: "No, I didn't."

61st Legislative Day

5/25/2007

Speaker Hannig: "He indicates he'll yield."

Reitz: "I said no."

McCarthy: Representative Reitz, are these license plates for both the front and the back of the vehicle?"

Reitz: "As far as I know, yes."

McCarthy: "Okay. So..."

Reitz: "Whatever way the Secretary of State does it."

McCarthy: "The commonly made suggestion to just put honorary license plates on the front of a vehicle was once again not needed in this legislation?"

Reitz: "Correct. But I... but I would support you in that endeavor."

McCarthy: "And you are aware of the dangers to the people of downstate Illinois by the… you know, the number of these license plates being manufactured in our state, making it almost impossible for the State Police down there to know who's who and protect the citizens of downstate Illinois?"

Reitz: "I... I don't believe the State Police were opposed to this Bill, but that could be possible."

McCarthy: "That's because they have their own license plate, I believe. so... but... Okay. Good luck."

Reitz: "Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "Any further discussion? Representative Fritchey."

Fritchey: "Just real... real quick, if I can. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Hannig: "He indicates he'll yield."

Fritchey: "So this also would allow us to have plates now for any college in a state that borders Illinois as well?"

61st Legislative Day

5/25/2007

Reitz: "No, it's... it's private colleges where they have at least ten thousand (10,000) alumni in the State of Illinois."

Fritchey: "But it would still be subject to expected amount of alumni living in Illinois. It would still be subject to the minimum subscription amounts, correct? So, I mean, if they had ten thousand (10,000) alumni, but only seven of them want license plates, we're not going to be required to issue license plates for them, right?"

Reitz: "No. I think on any of these special license plates, you have to have a minimum number before they'll even... an min... minimum number of applicants before they'll even produce them... is my understanding."

Fritchey: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Rose."

Rose: "Will the Sponsor yield for a quick question?"

Speaker Hannig: "He indicates he'll yield."

Rose: "The money in these collegiate license plates for out-of-state colleges would normally go into the University Grant Fund to come back to in-state students in the form of scholarships. Our analysis indicates that it's going into individual funds for those universities within the University Grant Fund. My question is this, I want to make sure that this money is going to go to in state students in the form of scholarships, not out-of-state students?"

Reitz: "That's my understanding from the… that… that was an Amendment brought forth by another member, and its my understanding that it would be for in-state students for scholarships at those universities."

Rose: "Okay. Thank you."

61st Legislative Day

5/25/2007

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Reitz to close."

Reitz: "Thank you. I would appreciate your support."

Speaker Hannig: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Kosel, do you wish to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 102 voting 'yes' and 13 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Dunkin, on Senate Bill 182. Out of the record. Representative Reitz, on Senate Bill 201. Should we read that one? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 201, a Bill for an Act concerning wildlife. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Reitz."

Reitz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 201 adds a two-day, youth-only hunting season between September 1 and October 1. And then it clarifies other language as far as permits are concerned, but the intent here is to... It's brought forth by the Illinois Bow Hunters Society, and it will create a special two-day youth hunting season to allow our youth to become acclimated with hunting. And I'd be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Hannig: "This is on the Order of Short Debate. We'll put it on Standard Debate and accommodate a couple of Members. Representative Bost, you're recognized for 5 minutes."

Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yie... I think I've answered my own question, Representative, but it..."

Speaker Hannig: "Indicates he'll yield."

61st Legislative Day

5/25/2007

Bost: "But is youth... it's anything under sixteen (16). Is that correct?"

Reitz: "I believe that's correct. I'll pull the special language up."

Bost: "Okay. Just... when people would call my office, I'd like..."

Reitz: "It's youth as... We haven't changed the definition, that's correct."

Bost: "Okay. Thank you."

Reitz: "I believe it is."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Fritchey."

Fritchey: "Thank you, Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Hannig: "He indicates he'll yield."

Fritchey: "Representative, this may be a city ignorance question here, but... so a youth-only hunting permit or a youth-only hunting season, so it's to promote getting young people involved in hunting, correct?"

Reitz: "Correct."

Fritchey: "But they'd obviously be going out with an adult, correct?"

Reitz: "Yes. In most instances, some if they have... if they're able to hunt on their own they... you know, they go, but most of them are accompanied by an adult, the younger ones."

Fritchey: "Well, but couldn't... but couldn't they do that already? And I'm not arguing..."

Reitz: "Yes. Yes. Yes, they can."

Fritchey: "...I just don't understand it."

Reitz: "This just adds another two-day season, allows the department the ability to add two (2) more days to the youth hunting season in this period."

61st Legislative Day

5/25/2007

Fritchey: "But why... why couldn't... why isn't a youth allowed to go with an adult on any day during the legal hunting season?"

Reitz: "They can."

Fritchey: "So why do we..."

Reitz: "This is just because it will allow the youth to not have to compete with the other hunters, so they have an opportunity to get out there and use that. And probably the biggest problem is sometimes school will interfere with that and they can set up youth-only so that the youth will have an opportunity and not have to go in the woods with all the traditional hunting se..."

Fritchey: "Well, here... and I think I get it... I'm just trying to figure this out. I mean, you're not going to have groups of, you know, fifteen year olds going out by themselves..."

Reitz: "No."

Fritchey: "...off in the woods hunting."

Reitz: "No."

Fritchey: "So they're going to be out with adults, but they can do that anyway though, right?"

Reitz: "They can do that during the regular hunting season, but when they're out there then there are, you know, thousands and thousands of hunters during the regular season. This will just be... allow them to go out and be properly trained and not have to be..."

Fritchey: "So... so during a youth hunting season, the only adults that would be out there would be adults that are out there with kids?"

61st Legislative Day

5/25/2007

Reitz: "Right. And we strengthened the provisions so that no one can use any type of permits to make sure that you won't have adults hunting during that season."

Fritchey: "Got it. Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Reitz to close."

Reitz: "Thank you. Appreciate your support."

Speaker Hannig: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Flowers, do you wish to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 115 voting 'yes' and 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Sacia, on Senate Bill 216. Do you wish to call... do you wish us to call this Bill? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 216, a Bill for an Act concerning wildlife. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Hannig: "The Gentleman from Winnebago, Representative Sacia."
- Sacia: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, a relatively straightforward Bill, just allows an individual age 62 or older to have the privilege of using a crossbow during bow season. Be glad to answer any questions."
- Speaker Hannig: "The Gentleman moves for the passage of Senate Bill 216. And on that question, the Gentleman from Bond, Representative Stephens."
- Stephens: "Will the Gentleman yield for a question?"

61st Legislative Day

5/25/2007

Speaker Hannig: "He indicates he'll yield."

Stephens: "Is there something that happens when you get to be over 62 that I need to know about?"

Sacia: "If... if there was ever a Bill that I prayed would slide through, this was it, Representative Stephens. You know..."

Stephens: "We are a victim of our own comments here on the House Floor and..."

Sacia: "Yes, we are. Yes..."

Stephens: "...on more than one occasion."

Sacia: "Yes, we are."

Stephens: "The fact that you can stand with any forty-year-old in a contest of pulling a bow or is... Is that just not true anymore? Have you had a birthday? What's going on here?"

Sacia: "Thank you."

Stephens: "How old are you, Representative?"

Sacia: "I'm right about there, but it... it does not apply to me.

This came to me from my Senator, Senator Sieben, and a constituent in our district. And I agreed to carry the Bill, in spite of the fact that I knew what I was in for."

Stephens: "Well, to that, Mr. Speaker, since we're doing this for a former Representative and now Senator Sieben, who is obviously a little bit over the hill, why don't we just go ahead and unanimously support the Gentleman's Bill with a Legislator... a State Representative exemption."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Mulligan."

Mulligan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Hannig: "He indicates he'll yield."

Mulligan: "I certainly understand being over 62, so I'm not going there. I'm just wondering, the crossbow obviously has

61st Legislative Day

5/25/2007

more of a powerful mechanism than hunting with a regular bow, correct?"

Sacia: "Technically, that would really be a... more of a technical question, depending upon the strength of the bowhunter and how far back they can pull the... the string. The reality is, is simply that many people are in a situation right now who want to hunt with a bow, and the only way for them to get a crossbow exemption right now is to go through a very expensive medical procedure. I believe DNR is neutral on the Bill. They recognize that the true bowhunters simply want the ability to stay in the woods and hunt when they can no longer physically do it and... and it's an effort to try to work around having this very, very expensive medical situation, which they have to renew periodically."

Mulligan: "All right. So, if... if you're a bowhunter, my brother-in-law was a bowhunter, and if you're a bowhunter, unless you have a condition, say you're arthritic or something is... would be hampering you from doing regular... you're probably not going to ask for this anyway."

Sacia: "Exactly."

Mulligan: "Because I would think the pride of being able to go out and do it is part of why they're doing the bow hunting to begin with."

Sacia: "I think that's exactly correct, Representative."

Mulligan: "Okay. Thank you. I'm willing to support your Bill."

Sacia: "Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Osterman."

Osterman: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Hannig: "He indicates he'll yield."

61st Legislative Day

5/25/2007

Osterman: "Representative Sacia, you know, you peaked my interest when you talked about this medical procedure. So someone's got to go to a doctor..."

Sacia: "Yes, Sir."

Osterman: "...and have a procedure done on them?"

Sacia: "Under... under current... right now that's the way it is.

If... if you need an exemption where you... physically cannot handle a bow, and you want to have the privilege of utilizing a crossbow, then you have... under current law that's what you have to do is get this very expensive medical procedure."

Osterman: "Well, why don't you enlighten the… the Body and tell us what that procedure is. I mean, I'm kind of losing you on that, so what… what's the procedure that's done?"

Sacia: "Maybe if there's a member of staff here that can help me with that. I'm not exactly sure myself, other than I know in committee it was articulated that, you know, a series of medical procedures... If you'd like, I'll take it out of the record and get that answered for you, Sir."

Osterman: "No. I just... it... it sounds like, you know, medical procedure..."

Sacia: "I understand... from what I understood in committee from the Gentleman in... in DNR that they must go through a very... it can't just be a cursory medical examination. It has to be a very thorough physical examination to certify that you no longer can... can utilize a crossbow or... I'm sorry, a bow. I've just been advised that you have to prove your disability under current law. You have to prove your disability... say you have an arthritic arm or shoulder or

61st Legislative Day

5/25/2007

- whatever and in some cases it requires MRIs and things of that nature."
- Osterman: "Again, you know, the way you sounded, medical procedure to have a permit and now it's like you have to prove that you're okay to do this so... It doesn't sound like you're really clear on what that is and I don't know..."
- Sacia: "And... and I'll concede that you're correct, Sir. I will concede that and that's why I'm more than willing to take it out of the record if you'd like me to and... and get the specifics. I just had it brought to my attention that you have to prove that you have a physical condition."
- Osterman: "Well, I would hope that... before the Governor puts this on his desk that you could meet with the Governor and enlighten him on those procedures so that you're clear and he's clear before he makes the decision to sign the Bill or not sign the Bill."
- Sacia: "I... I would be more than happy to meet with the Governor anytime."
- Speaker Hannig: "Representative Sullivan. Now, we've had... we've actually had three (3) in response. Would you like to rise in support?"
- Sullivan: "Certainly, I rise in support of the Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Okay."

Sullivan: "To the Bill. To answer the previous speaker's question, there isn't an actual procedure you have to go through. It's just a test to prove that you cannot physically use a compound bow, which you would have to pull back on, and therefore using the other form, which is a crossbow, which is much easier to use. Going through these

61st Legislative Day

5/25/2007

procedures or tests is extensive and... and that's just for clarification to the Bill. And I rise in support of the Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Sacia to close."

Sacia: "Just ask for your support."

Speaker Hannig: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 115 voting 'yes' and 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Yarbrough, you have Senate Bill 220. Shall we read the Bill? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 220, a Bill for an Act concerning school costs. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Yarbrough."

Yarbrough: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I have for your consideration today Senate Bill 220. It amends the loan... the Local Planning Technical Assistance Act to require the state to pay each school district, subject to appropriation, an affordable multifamily housing school cost reimbursement. This reimbursement is to be calculated separately for each district at eleven hundred and twenty-three dollars (\$1,123) for each affordable multifamily housing unit with at least two bedrooms in a district and five hundred and sixty-two dollars (\$562) for each additional bedroom. If the appropriations are insufficient, then the reimbursement must be prorated. The purpose behind

61st Legislative Day

5/25/2007

this reimbursement is to offset the decline in property tax revenue a school district would face because affordable housing may lower property values in the area thereby resulting in less property tax revenue. This is an initiative of the Metropolitan Planning Council. I know of no opposition to this measure and would be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Hannig: "We're going to move this to Standard Debate and Representative Mulligan, you're recognized for 5 minutes."

Mulligan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Hannig: "She indicates she'll yield."

Mulligan: "Representative, I'm trying to... get my brain around your Bill. Having done impact fees for a law firm and worked in development, I would presume that what this does for affordable housing is creates an impact fee that would go to the school district. But instead of the developer paying it, because it's low-income housing, you want the state to pay it."

Yarbrough: "That's correct."

Mulligan: "All right. So, if you put it low-income housing, they will come. And so just like you put up a development in a community and there are... new families coming in, which put an impact on the school district, the same would happen perhaps with a low-income housing project, which would add additional member... additional children in a school district all at one time. And then what you would have is an impact on the school district, and what you're looking for is the state to pick up those funds."

Yarbrough: "Yes. Now this is subject to appropriation."

61st Legislative Day

5/25/2007

Mulligan: "Is there any federal funding... I'm trying to remember who created the mandate, I thought it was state and federal, the mandate for federal housing, for low-income housing in communities, and did the study. And I'm just wondering if there's any federal funding that would be a match for this or if it just all comes from the state or say the City of Chicago, which is quite large and demolished a lot of low-income housing and hasn't totally replaced it, if they would also be part of a governmental entity that would put money into that for local school districts?"

Yarbrough: "I'm not sure if there's a federal match for this at all. What I do know is that, you know, under the Governor's housing plan... I mean, and he's supportive of this measure, the plan ceased to develop, preserve or rehabilitate a range of affordable housing options that's consistent with affirmative fair housing provisions and address low-income populations."

Mulligan: "All right. So, would you have to show... say in some areas low-income housing people mainly use senior housing, as opposed to housing for people that would have children. So would you have to prove if you were that school district that the low-income housing that was put into that area in order to be eligible for funds generated so many additional pupils for that school district?"

Yarbrough: "I... I guess I don't understand your question."

Mulligan: "Well, there's several types of low-income housing, so if you put up senior low-income housing, why would your school district be in line to get extra money? But if you put up low-income housing that houses families with children

61st Legislative Day

5/25/2007

that would impact the school district, then I would think you would be eligible. But under both circumstances, I mean, I see no reason to give the additional money to an area that's getting senior housing that doesn't generate a burden on the school district."

- Yarbrough: "Okay. This Bill provides that no school district can receive a reimbursement unless the Illinois Housing Development Authority first certifies that the housing advances the preservation or live-near-work goals of the Governor's housing plan. It doesn't mention anything about senior housing whatsoever."
- Mulligan: "The Governor's had some interesting housing plans in the last couple of years, so I'm not going to go there, but my concern is that it only go to school districts where the low-income housing generates families with children that impact the school district, because that would be fair to that school district, as opposed to a district that it doesn't generate any children to the school district, because then it... Why should they get the money?"
- Yarbrough: "Okay. It doesn't distinguish whether there are children or not. It..."
- Mulligan: "Well, is it distinguishing the tax space? Is there a reason for this that justifies the dollars?"
- Yarbrough: "Okay. The purpose behind this reimbursement is to offset the decline in property tax revenue a school district would face because affordable housing may lower the property value in the area. And then that would result in less property tax revenue."

61st Legislative Day

5/25/2007

Mulligan: "All right. Without going through your whole Bill, is there a system in this where you would have to justify that in order to be eligible for the money?"

Yarbrough: "Yes."

- Mulligan: "And what type of system is that? Is it a grant system where you have to fill out forms showing that you had X number of property..."
- Yarbrough: "Okay. The Bill states that it provides that no district can receive a reimbursement under... unless the Illinois Development Housing Authority first certifies that the... housing advances the preservation or..."
- Speaker Hannig: "Why don't you finish your... your sentence, Representative."
- Yarbrough: "...that live-near-work goals of the Governor's housing plan. It further seeks to develop, preserve or rehabilitate the range of affordable housing options. That's what the Bill does."
- Speaker Hannig: "So, Representative Mulligan, your time has expired. Would you bring your remarks to a close."
- Mulligan: "I'm just trying to get at the fairness of the Bill.

 I'd like to support it. I see people that support it that...

 that I respect, but I want to make sure it's fair in how the

 money is distributed. That's what I was trying to do."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Eddy."

Eddy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Hannig: "She indicates she'll yield."

Eddy: "Representative, I... I'm not sure I'm going to vote on this. I just want to make sure I understand it because there... there is some components to it that I think the

61st Legislative Day

5/25/2007

previous speaker began to get into that really interest me. If the area where the low-cost housing has been established does not experience a decline in the value of property, if... if there is no decline, they will not receive the... the impact fee?"

Yarbrough: "You're saying if, if there's no decline in property value, you're saying that they wouldn't receive the... the benefit we're talking about here?"

Eddy: "Right."

Yarbrough: "In the Bill, it doesn't specify that; it just says if they're certified. If it..."

Eddy: "So is it your assumption that the certification process would include a determination as to whether or not the property value had declined?"

Yarbrough: "Yes."

Eddy: "And that's your purpose. It's only in those cases where the… the low-cost housing has impacted the… the… the property values negatively that they would be able to access this fund?"

Yarbrough: "That's correct."

Eddy: "Okay. I think that's important for intent. I don't know when things leave here sometimes the rules and how things are developed kind of take on a life of their own, and I just wanted to make sure that... that your intent will match the... the eventual rulemaking."

Yarbrough: "Yes."

Eddy: "Okay. Now is there anything that... that receiving this money would cause to change the amount of general state aid

61st Legislative Day

5/25/2007

the district would otherwise receive? Is there a reduction in general state aid?"

Yarbrough: "There's no provision in the Bill that speaks to that. No."

Eddy: "Okay. So this isn't counted as local effort in the formula. They would receive the full state aid that they normally would for... for the number of students?"

Yarbrough: "That's correct. That's correct."

Eddy: "Okay. Well, thank you very much. It's an interesting Bill, and I'm going to listen to the rest of any questions, but... and certainly understand what you're trying to do here. We're trying to provide for an area affordable housing..."

Yarbrough: "That's correct."

Eddy: "...while not impacting what that does to how we fund schools, which is property tax."

Yarbrough: "Yes."

Eddy: "If... If we're so reliant on property taxes to fund schools, then we have to make sure that there's not a negative impact from other things we're trying to do."

Yarbrough: "That would be correct."

Eddy: "Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "Is there any further discussion? Then Representative Yarbrough to close."

Yarbrough: "The Metropolitan Planning Council talks about this is the little Bill that could and I agree. I ask for a favorable vote so that we can help those school districts. Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open.

61st Legislative Day

5/25/2007

Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Yarbrough, do you wish to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 113 voting 'yes' and 2 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Mathias, you have Senate Bill 223. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 223, a Bill for an Act to revise a law by combining multiple enactments and making technical corrections. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Mathias."

Mathias: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is the First General Revisory Act of 2007. Basically what it does it's a technical Bill. It makes no substantive changes in the law. It's prepared by LRB. We haven't had one, I think, since 2002, and it combines all of the… revises the enactments of the 92nd, 93rd, and 94th General Assemblies and makes technical corrections in statutes where we've passed a law that may conflict with some of the wording in the existing statute. This changes the wording. The Bill is 92 pages, and I'll be glad to start reading it with the… if… if the… the Speaker feels it's necessary. If not, I ask for your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hannig: "This is on the Order of Short Debate. Does anyone stand in response? Then the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 114 voting 'yes' and 1

61st Legislative Day

5/25/2007

voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Bellock, you have Senate Bill 233. Mr. Clerk read the Bill."

Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 233, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Bellock."

Bellock: "Yes, Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 233 is regarding the MRSA Control Program for hospitals in the State of Illinois. This is a Bill that I've talked to most of you about. It passed unanimously out of the House about a month ago, and now it's back in the identical form. What this Bill does is to test all people in intensive care units or at-risk patients for MRSA. It isolates them if they're found to have MRSA. It's a strict hand washing regimen, and it is reporting the MRSA infection rate to public health."

Speaker Hannig: "This is on the Order of Short Debate. And in response the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Dunkin."

Dunkin: "Thank you, Representative. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Hannig: "She indicates she'll yield."

Dunkin: "Representative, I know you've apparently worked very, very diligent and hard on this. You lobbied me twice for the same Bill in one day I believe, so I respect that folk who work their Bills, it means a lot about the legislation. But prior to me coming in here today, I was handed some information that spoke a little differently of this Bill, and it had some concerns regarding this only sort of goes

61st Legislative Day

5/25/2007

part... part of the way or doesn't it really completely deal with the matter that you're trying to resolve here in full, and I'm trying to get a sense of some of the opposition of the Senate Bill and the editorial that the <u>Tribune</u> did and sort of where we are now with making this a workable, good, solution for the hospitals that we're trying to impact here in the state."

Bellock: Thank you very much. And I'm sorry if I "Right. didn't say that to you Representative Dunkin, because the first thing I said to most of the Representatives was about the opposition from the epidemiologists. And the point that I'm trying to make with this Bill is that MRSA is the staff infection that has risen from 2 percent in 1975. In 1995, it was 35 percent of all staff infections and in 2005 it was 68 percent of all staff infections are MRSA. So this is the point that we are trying to address and seven (7) or eight (8) other states in the United States are starting to address also. The Veterans' hospitals have mandated that throughout the United States all Veterans' hospitals must test everyone for MRSA. What the epidemiologists are concerned about is that they feel that you're putting MRSA as an infection above the other staff infections. continuing to work with them. We have worked with them about a trailer Bill to talk about if a hospital does not have a severe MRSA infection rate that we would acknowledge that. We've gone back and forth, but that has not been resolved yet. But we are continuing to work with them now. point is, and this is the point of all the MRSA survivors, right now there are eleven thousand (11,000) people in

61st Legislative Day

5/25/2007

hospitals in the State of Illinois. A hundred and twenty-six thousand (126,000) people in the United States that are suffering from MRSA. Twenty-five hundred (2,500) people died last year in Illinois hospitals from MRSA. One out of three... a third of the people who get MRSA die within three It is a serious, serious infection. (3) days. It is the number one infection that states across the United States are addressing because it seems to be the one that people are dying from. The Hospital Association is strongly for the Bill. They are the ones that have provided us over the last couple of months all of the information. The Illinois State Medical Society is strongly for the Bill. Illinois Nurses Association is strongly for the Bill. The concern of the epidemiologists and public health is that there will be, you know, that the emphasis on other infections will be taken away from the MRSA but my reaction to them is this is the infection that is out of control at epidemic levels. It's taking people's lives by the day. is making people... But the Hospital Association alone have said people are re... are reluctant to go into hospitals because of this severe staff infection. So that's where we are right now. I continue to work with them on their issue."

Dunkin: "Okay. What a... Again, when I was coming in here, I was lobbying. They said that there was some concern that you weren't working with them or that there... there hasn't been a consensus or that they would like to work with you. A number of... I have... I have a long list here of opponents against your Bill, and they even handed me this <u>Tribune</u> editorial,

61st Legislative Day

5/25/2007

which doesn't necessarily mean it's... anything's valid now, but that... that... and I'll read it to you. It says, 'Many infectious disease specialists argue convincingly that the proposed law focuses to much attention on one... one super bug, potentially draining resources away from treating many others. And the proposed law doesn't take into account that some hospitals probably have the problem under control, and some don't, or that some have other problems that they need to address more urgently. The better way to attack this is to set thresholds and force screening and isolation only in those hospitals that fail to control MRSA effectively on their own.' And they're saying that approach allows hospitals latitude to target other infectious bugs."

- Bellock: "And that is a comment, but the rest of the <u>Tribune</u> editorial was in support of all the work that we're doing for this because they say how out of control... It's at epic..."
- Speaker Hannig: "Representative, your time has expired. Why don't we let Representative Bellock finish her thought and then we'll let you conclude briefly. Okay? So, Representative Bellock, would you finish your response."
- Bellock: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. That is their concern about the Bill. They are in full support of the other things that are in the Bill because their front page article the week before that was on the super bug. Also Governing Magazine this week has identified MRSA as the super bug that is killing people all over the United States, this infection more than others. We have continued to work with them; we asked them to hold House Bill 192 so we could maybe amend that onto our Bill, but they moved that forward

61st Legislative Day

5/25/2007

and it's gone out. And I'm in support of that Bill; it's Representative Flowers' Bill. But we wanted to work with them, we have still worked with them, and I have sent them a message yesterday, or two (2) days ago, right after we had our discussion, that we would work with them on... if a hospital had a 10 percent MRSA rate, they would not have to implement this. So we are continuing to work on it, but at the same time I want to tell everybody that this is an issue. This is a staff infection that is out of control at epidemic levels. There is no other staff infection that has increased at this rate. And that's why people across the United States... The Governor of Pennsylvania has put this specifically on MRSA in his health care Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative, could you... could you bring your answer to a close, please."

Bellock: "Thank you, I'm sorry."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Dunkin, could you bring your remarks to a close."

Dunkin: "Yes. Thank you, Representative. Again, I applaud you for your due diligence in this Bill and the efforts that you've taken. Again, it just raise a... an alarm. We consider you now, I guess, the infect... the infectious bug disease expert in hospitals. Maybe you and Mary Flowers, I don't know. But I just wanted to bring that to your attention because they certainly caught me coming in, and they said, look, there's some real concerns. We need to try to work this thing through; it has not happened. And I said I would address it. I didn't realize it was going to be called

61st Legislative Day

5/25/2007

today, but I will take you for your word on it because I respect you as a colleague. Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "I have one in favor and one in response. And Representative Coulson, you're next on the list and you have 5 minutes."

Coulson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Hannig: "She indicates she'll yield."

Coulson: "Representative, I know you've worked very hard on this Bill, and I just have a couple clarifying questions that I would like to ask you. And one is while there are... while we agree that there are many people dying in hosp... or after acquiring a hospital infection called MRSA, but there are also MRSA infections in other settings as well as in the community, correct?"

Bellock: "Correct."

Coulson: "And so I think one of the concerns I have is that we make it very clear to the Assembly here that... that its... that this is a step in the process of trying to have better control of infectious diseases throughout the state and that we don't just consider this the onl... one and only step as we go forward."

Bellock: "Absolutely, I agree with you, Representative Coulson and we've been in a lot of talks together. And absolutely, in fact, 192 addressed more the community issue, but this is just a step. And that's why initially we worked on, rather than universal screening of all people coming into hospitals, we just did specifically people in intensive care units and at-risk patients. There also is a sunset clause in the Bill, too, so that if this does not work out, if it

61st Legislative Day

5/25/2007

detracts from emphasis on other infections, that there is a sunset clause."

Coulson: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Hamos."

"Thank you. Ladies and Gentlemen, I stand in strong Hamos: support of this Bill, and I commend the Sponsor for bringing this forward and being so diligent about it. I, too, have put a lot of time into this learning about it. And, Ladies and Gentlemen, not only did we find out that in fact this is epidemic proportions, we were able to discover eleven thousand (11,000) cases of this last year. It's a number that nobody was focusing on; it's a number that was not known to the hospitals, individual hospitals. It was a number that was not being... that was not raising the kind of concerns that we are now raising. What we learned in doing this research is that the hospitals themselves for the past twenty-five (25), thirty (30) years have recommended basically one strategy for dealing with this, which is hand washing. That has not worked. This issue is at epidemic proportions and needs a new protocol, a new intervention, a new way to deal with it; that's all this Bill does. this Bill will sunset in three (3) years so that everybody can sit back, reflect on what's working. We are following the model being established in the Veterans Administration hospitals. Many states are approaching... doing this kind of legislation, countries abroad already have instituted it. My own hospital in Evanston is doing screening in every... for every single person who walks in. Mandatory cultures for every single person who walks in the door, they have been

61st Legislative Day

5/25/2007

able to reduce MRSA and reduce costs. We're not even going that far in this legislation. What we're trying is at-risk patients, patients in ICUs. This is a modest approach to a very important problem, and I seek an 'aye' vote as well."

Speaker Hannig: "We've had two in support and two in response and, Representative Flowers, you're next for 5 minutes."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My name was used in debate, like to say for the record that, and I would just Representative, I, too, support what it is that you're trying to do, but I also know what the opposition is to a certain degree because the moneys that will be used specifically to deal with the infection in ICU whereas so that it's not necessarily so. And as you stated in your remarks that the vast majority of the MRSA is coming from the community, and so if all the moneys is spent in just the ICU portion of a hospital, that leaves the rest of the hospital unprotected and untested, and the people in the community that come into the hospital that happen not to go into ICU, they, too, will be unprotected when the studies have shown that the southern corridor for the State of Illinois is where MRSA is coming from. And the last speaker just spoke and said how her hospital is testing everyone. Well, we also know that everyone in that area, and chances of them being infected by MRSA is very few, and once again those dollars, those precious dollars, are going to be taken away. But in all of this, we do have a hospital report card that should be reporting what happens in ICU and the rest of the hospitals as well. And so I reluctantly... I support what it is that you're trying to do, and I want to thank you for

61st Legislative Day

5/25/2007

working with me on my Bill, as well as me trying to work with you on yours, but again, you have to understand that there's only a few dollars, and you want it to go to a particular area in a hospital when I know the vast majority and the biggest problem is out in the community. So, thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "We've had three in opposition or response and two in support. The rules provide for one additional speaker in support. Representative Colvin, are you in support?"

Colvin: "Can I ask a question?"

Speaker Hannig: "Okay. So, we'll let you ask your question, Representative Colvin. And the Sponsor will yield."

Colvin: "Will the Sponsor yield for a question? Thank you very Representative Bellock, you and I, indeed, spoke a little bit about this Bill yesterday, and I did get a chance to speak to a few public health doctors in Cook County and one downstate fellow, and I think most of them would agree with the premise in which you are... drafted this Bill and tried to limit the exposure of MRSA for hospitalized patients. The argument that most of them made was issues relative to cost and also the issue of if you're focusing on this one particular strain or virus that through the force of law, then the resources and time and money and effort it takes to address MRSA, there are literally thousands of other viruses and strains that because of financial reasons, manpower, staffing, that they may not be paying attention to other viruses and strains that can be equally devastating. And that while you're paying attention to one problem, another problem is growing out of control, and what we end

61st Legislative Day

5/25/2007

up doing is kind of going down this... this slope instead of letting doctors set medical policy with respect to how you isolate and eradicate these viruses that the Legislature... today it's MRSA, tomorrow it's another one, the next day it's another one, and the next thing you know, you have a bunch of mandates dealing with all of these different viruses. If you could just care to respond to why singling out MRSA I... I did hear your argument yesterday of why it's, you know, one of the bigger ones, but bigger doesn't necessarily mean that the other ones are any the less harmless. Just so you can respond to why just MRSA and not maybe coming up with a piece of legislation that would deal with this in a more holistic fashion."

Bellock: "Yes, thank you very much, Representative Colvin and I definitely want to respond to you on that issue because the reason is, and I am sensitive to the concerns of the epidemiologists, but the point that we have asked them, this is a bipartisan effort. I've been working on this a year and a half. But we had a hearing with Representative Hamos, Senator Garrett, Senator Radogno and Senator Cullerton and we listened to every epidemiologist that came there. point was, they said this is a problem, but it is an epidemic and that's what we're talking about. None of the other staph infections that they have spoken about are at the epidemic levels that this has. As I said, this has risen from 1975, it was only 2 percent of all staph infections. In 1995, it was 35 percent of all staph infections are MRSA. In 2005, it was 60... around 68 percent of all infections are MRSA. This has increased 36 fold in the last

61st Legislative Day

5/25/2007

several years. We asked the epidemiologist in public health what have you done about this? We have the people from the MRSA survivors network there who their loved ones have died. I said, 'Are we just going to do another study so that in three (3) more years when you come back it's at 80 percent Nobody could point to anything that was being done. This is an attempt to head this issue straight on and do something. As we've said there is a sunset clause, but you cannot compare and this is why every medical journal, all the states in the United States, the Governing Magazine, the Chicago Tribune, this is why they have all picked up on the MRSA issue. That is the issue that is killing people. Twenty-five hundred (2500) people died and those are the only ones that we know about this year in Illinois hospitals alone. When the Illinois Hospital Association first heard about this Bill, they were not in support of it. are the strongest proponents of this Bill because when they started doing their research they saw that this particular infection called MRSA, methicillin-resistant staph staphylococcus aureus, is the one that people are dying from. It's at epidemic levels and it's out of control and nobody is doing anything that we can see that is eradicating this. And I do not want to wait three (3) more years to see that it's risen to 80 percent. In the veterans hospitals throughout the United States, this infection is at an 85 percent rate. That is why they have mandated exactly the four (4) things in our Bill and I really do not honestly see how any..."

61st Legislative Day

5/25/2007

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Colvin, your... your time has expired. Would you... you want to bring your remarks to a close?"

"Sure. Representative Bellock, certainly I can see Colvin: where there's a lot of bipartisan support for this Bill and support of it, although at the same time when I look at the li... there's a whole sheet of opponents, most of them medical professionals from around the state who stand in opposition to the Bill. I just wonder if their position in terms of a more holo... holistic approach is the right way to go. I'm not a medical doctor, I don't know. I guess, when I look at the bipartisan support versus the bipartisan support with respect to geography from public health doctors epidemiologists from across the state and I see at the bottom of the list from at least four (4) different... four (4) other states that maybe they may have their approach may require some merit, as well. I certainly appreciate the ... what you're trying to do and yesterday, I think I agreed with what you were trying to do, but just listening to their argument on the holistic approach makes a little sense to But I appreciate your efforts in what you're trying to accomplish. Thank you very much."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Bellock to close."

Bellock: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. And thank you all of you for all your comments and input into this issue. I certainly am not a medical professional. I have just spent a year and half studying this because of the MRSA survivors group in my area. I am... have been working with the epidemiologists and public health, I have said I will

61st Legislative Day

5/25/2007

continue to work with them on hospitals that do not have a large MRSA rate which I don't know if there are that many in the State of Illinois that don't have it, but I will continue to work on them with this. But I'm telling you right now, that this is an issue that is actually a worldwide issue. The western European countries have already addressed it and eradicated it by some of the issues that the four (4) simple things that we have in here. hand washing regimen is the simplest form of eradicating this, but we need more, we need to isolate these people. cannot continue to wait three (3) more years until this rate has increased from 65 percent to 85 percent and then say we're not going to do three (3) more studies, we're going to do something to save the lives. I re... I appreciate what Representative Flowers said, I definitely, when we first approached this, wanted to approach it in a larger faction, but we found that the hospitals and the doctors would not This is a Bill that every... the Hospital support that. Association supports, the Illinois Medical Society supports, the Illinois nurses, all the medical professionals, outside of epidemiologists, support this issue. They see it as an epidemic, not only in Illinois but in the entire United States. And somebody has to start action to address it. I appreciate your vote. Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Ford, do you wish to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question,

61st Legislative Day

- there are 106 voting 'yes' and 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Bost, you have Senate Bill 253. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 253, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Hannig: "Representative Lindner, for what reason do you rise?"
- Lindner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm... On Senate Bill 223, my button was inadvertently pushed as red and I meant to vote 'yes'."
- Speaker Hannig: "The record will so reflect. And now, Representative Bost."
- Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 253 very simply says that in the… on municipal elections that if someone is establishing residency requirement, that residency requirement can be established while they've established a residency in the military. And when they come back they can run. Be glad to answer any questions on it."
- Speaker Hannig: "This is on Short Debate. Does anyone stand in response? Then the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Mautino, do you wish to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 114 voting 'yes' and 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Tracy, you have Senate Bill

61st Legislative Day

5/25/2007

274. Do you wish us to read that Bill? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 274, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "The Lady from Brown, Representative Tracy."

Tracy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill... House Bill 274 adds an offense of... or excuse me, Senate Bill 274 adds the offense of attempt to possess metha... anhydrous ammonia in the... it's an addition to the Methamphetamine Precursor Act. And I would urge an 'aye' vote to add this offense to this Act. And I would entertain any questions."

Speaker Hannig: "This is on the Order of Short Debate. And in response, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Molaro."

Molaro: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Hannig: "She indicates she'll yield."

Molaro: "You know, you... you know, we asked about this in committee and I'm... I'm not trying to be funny, but I do have to ask, you either possess something or you don't you can attempt... you can attempt to do anything."

Tracy: "The methamphetamine."

Molaro: "Attempt to steal... I... I really don't understand what attempt to possess means. So, if you could flesh that out for us, so someone could under... Yeah, it's me. How are you? If you can just flesh out what attempt to possess, because mostly in drug cases that's where we hear possession. It's illegal to possess, you know, certain drugs. You know, attempting to possess a drug is kind of hard or attempting to possess a gun or a handgun on the streets is hard. You either possess it or you don't. It's hard to possess it.

61st Legislative Day

5/25/2007

So I guess the question would be, if I went up to you and you were selling me a handgun, a legal handgun, legal drugs, and I said to you, 'all right what do you want for this handgun', and you have it and you say, 'five hundred (500)' and I go 'no, I'll give you two fifty (\$250)' and you go, 'no, I want five hundred (\$500)' and I go, 'no thanks' and you walk away. So I never touch the handgun, it never was... is in my possession. I don't know if you could charge me with a crime of attempting to possess a handgun. Now... I..."

Tracy: "Well, thank you."

Molaro: "So, if you could explain that I'd appreciate it."

Tracy: "Well, certainly, and you have to understand the unique ingredient of anhydrous ammonia. It's an ingredient that is a precursor to the manufacture of methamphetamine. A person could be drilling a hole in an anhydrous tank, attempting to possess it but not having an appropriate container to actually contain it, and that again would be an attempt to possess. In the particular instance where the state's attorney brought it to my... Senator Bomke's attention and I later spoke to State's Attorney Kim Baumgardener, the police had turned a corner and just happened to observe a suspect approaching an anhydrous tank with a cooler trying to begin the process of possessing that anhydrous, but they caught him before he actually had to... the opportunity to possess it in the container. And..."

Molaro: "Well, you have now convinced me. Listening to that, it makes sense that you can attempt to possess. So, I'm for the Bill; this makes sense. Thank you."

Tracy: "Thank you very much."

61st Legislative Day

- Speaker Hannig: "Representative Reis. Any further Members wishing to speak? Then Representative Tracy to close."
- Tracy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would urge an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Hannig: "The question is... the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Granberg and Colvin, do you wish to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 112 voting 'yes' and 3 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, read Senate Bill 280. Excuse me, Mr. Clerk. Representative Arroyo, for what reason do you rise? Representative Arroyo, I couldn't hear you."
- Arroyo: "I want to put that on a 'yes' vote. I pressed the wrong button on Senate Bill 27... 274."
- Speaker Hannig: "Okay. The record will so reflect. And so Mr. Clerk, read Senate Bill 280."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 280, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Hannig: "Representative Coulson."
- Coulson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 280 amends the Barber, Cosmetology, Esthetist and Nail Technology Act. It requires that student refunds shall be made by a school within forty-five (45) days, rather than thirty (30) days. And this is to put us in alignment with federal regulations. And I'd appreciate an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Hannig: "This is on the Order of Short Debate. Does anyone stand in response? Then the question is, 'Shall this

61st Legislative Day

5/25/2007

Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Krause and Granberg, do you wish to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 113 voting 'yes' and 1 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Reboletti, you have Senate Bill 284. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 284, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this House... Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Hannig: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Reboletti."
- Reboletti: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Bill creates the community integrated living arrangements for children ages fifteen (15) to eighteen (18), for children that have autism. This is a situation that, obviously, we have heard much about in the media that one out of about a hundred and fifty (150) children have this... this condition. We don't provide these types of housing arrangements and these also encourage the families to be involved. I know Representative Gordon passed House Bill 2002, which is a companion Bill. For some reason that is stuck in the Rules Committee and I would be... want to entertain any questions and urge an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Hannig: "This is on the Order of Short Debate. Does anyone stand in response? And the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The

61st Legislative Day

5/25/2007

voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Molaro, do you wish to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 115 voting 'yes' and 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Meyer, you have Senate Bill 285. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 285, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Meyer."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate Bill 285 provides that the mosquito abatement district may by ordinance annex additional contiguous territory within the city or a village if the district contains over 90 percent of the territory of the city or village and the territory is not incorporated within another mosquito abatement district. Provides that no contiguous territory may be an... annexed by a mosquito abatement district more then one (1) year after it has been included in the city or village. It provides no contiguous territory may be annexed by a mosquito abatement district if it expands a mosquito abatement district's boundaries outside of the county unless a district already contains territory in that county. It contains a provision for a backdoor referendum. It basically allows a mosquito bat... district to follow the same annexation rules the library district follows currently in communities."

Speaker Hannig: "The Gentleman moves for the passage of Senate Bill 285. Is there any discussion? Then the question is,

61st Legislative Day

5/25/2007

'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative... Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 66 voting 'yes' and 49 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, what's the status of Senate Bill 417?"

- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 417 is on the Order of Senate Bills-Third Reading."
- Speaker Hannig: "So, return that to the Order of Second Reading at the request of the Sponsor. On page 26 of the Calendar, under the Order of House Bills-Third Reading, Representative Rita, you have House Bill 1466. Okay. Out of the record. On page 28 of the Calendar, under the Order of House Bills-Third Reading is House Bill 3477. Representative Crespo, do you wish us to read the Bill? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3477, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hannig: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Crespo."
- Crespo: "Yeah. Thank you, Speaker, Members of the House. House Bill 3477 creates the new offense of unlawful use of encryption making it a Class A misdemeanor to use encryption to commit, conceal, or aid in the commission of any criminal offense. By encryption we mean altering a file using a secret code to prevent law enforcement from tracking down the person sending the file from the computer. The Bill basically provides a tool for law enforcement to go after

61st Legislative Day

5/25/2007

criminals who hide behind computers and encryption to commit their crimes. Other states such as Arkansas, Nevada, and Virginia currently have similar laws in place. I'll take any questions."

Speaker Hannig: "This is on the Order of Short Debate. Okay.

We'll move it to the Order of Standard Debate. And

Representative Lindner, you're... you're recognized for 5

minutes."

Lindner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Hannig: "He indicates he'll yield."

Lindner: "Representative, there's... what are you reclassifying?"

Crespo: "I'm sorry, I didn't hear the question."

Lindner: "What are you reclassifying?"

Crespo: "What am I classifying?"

Lindner: "What are you reclassifying?"

Crespo: "Well, we're not reclassifying anything. This is a new...

a new law that we're putting in place that the Attorney

General... Attorney General Office recommended."

Lindner: "All right. Are you repealing other Acts?"

Crespo: "I'm sorry, but I can't... I can't hear the Representative."

Lindner: "Are you repealing other Acts?"

Crespo: "No, we're not."

Lindner: "And my notes say that you were holding this on Second.

But I can't remember what for."

Crespo: "No, we... we put in an Amendment, and we moved it to Third. I'm not sure what your analysis says, Representative, but..."

61st Legislative Day

5/25/2007

Lindner: "Well, those are my notes from committee, that you were going to hold this on Second. So I believe it was for an Amendment. Was there an Amendment to this?"

Crespo: "There was an Amendment, yes."

Lindner: "And that's already been to committee?"

Crespo: "Correct."

Lindner: "All right. Could you tell me the structure and the current protocol for this?"

Crespo: "I'm sorry, the structure and the current protocol for what, Representative?"

Lindner: "For the Internet Crimes Enforcement Unit."

Crespo: "Again, I'm not sure I follow the question. Again, this is a totally new law that we're putting in the books, which was recommended by the Attorney General's Office. This is basic allowing them to go after crimes where people use encryption and try to hide behind a crime. This makes it easier for them to... to deal with this in court."

Lindner: "All right. Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Gordon."

Gordon: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Hannig: "He indicates he'll yield."

Gordon: "Representative Crespo, do the changes in the Bill reflect all of the recommendations and concerns of the Illinois Attorney General's Office?"

Crespo: "Yes, it does."

Gordon: "And when you initially brought the Bill to committee there was some significant problems that some people saw and you've addressed each and every one of those, correct?"

61st Legislative Day

5/25/2007

Crespo: "Yes, Representative, the biggest problem was originally the Illinois State Police wanted to create a task force. The Attorney General had a problem with that because it would've been redundant. They currently have a task force in place. The Illinois Crime Against Children's task force which pretty much does the same thing that the Illinois State Police wanted. So the Attorney General's Office had a problem with that and we deleted off that and what we left there was the… the unlawful use of encryption which, again, a new law in the books."

Gordon: "Right, and there's some clarification of some certain terms dealing with computers and computer crimes that you would then have to pu... to make it clear, when it comes to search warrants or prosecution of these crimes and dealing with the evidence, right?"

Crespo: "Right."

Gordon: "Okay. Thank you, Representative. To the Bill, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Hannig: "To the Bill."

Gordon: "Ladies and Gentlemen, the Representative has addressed all the concerns of the Attorney General's Office, as well as the law enforcement community. He clarifies a lot of the problems that law enforcement has with computer crimes, with prosecuting them, with getting the right type of search warrants out there and making sure that we can get this information from the Internet, from the computers that we seize, which we're having a problem with now. So, I commend him for doing a lot of work on this and I would urge an 'aye' vote."

61st Legislative Day

5/25/2007

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Dunkin."

Dunkin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Hannig: "He indicates he'll yield."

Dunkin: "Again, let me applaud you, Representative, for doing a lot of work on this legislation, as I understand it."

Crespo: "Thank you."

Dunkin: "How do we prosecute, currently, individuals who are a part of an Internet crime, such as pornography, already?"

Crespo: "Well, right now, again, they... they do... they do treat them in court. This is, again, just adding another element to allow the Attorney General Office to go after these guys if they're using encryption, which in the past they couldn't use this at all. So we're... we're classifying this as a misdemeanor, a misdemeanor which will make it easier for them to prosecute."

Dunkin: "Are there… is there a heavy precedent in Illinois today of… of a… of the unlawful use of encryption?"

Crespo: "According to the Attorney General's Office, yes, there is."

Dunkin: "To what extent or degree?"

Crespo: "I couldn't answer that."

Dunkin: "The question is, to what degree or what level is the...
the unuse... the unlawful use of encryption is active here in
the State of Illinois? You want to get the mic, staffer?"

Crespo: "Well, again, this is not only limited to pornography, Representative. It could be for anything else. Again, it's currently being used, but there's no law in the books that classifies this as a crime right now. Now, they do use encryption and they try to hide behind encryption. The

61st Legislative Day

5/25/2007

Attorney General's Office now has something they can go after, as well. Again, right."

Dunkin: "Well, you know what... I... I can't hear him. He's... he's..."

Crespo: "Right now, you can get prosecuted for the underlying crime, but not for the use of encryption, to hide behind that."

Dunkin: "Sure. Okay. Thank you, Mr. Sponsor."

Crespo: "Thank you for the question."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Reboletti."

Reboletti: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Hannig: "Indicates he'll yield."

Reboletti: "Representative, one of the concerns I have on this Bill is that in looking at the analysis is that if... if you're assisting somebody in a crime, it isn't... if you're part of the accountability of the crime and the crime being committed is a Class IV, is this a reduction in penalties? I... I don't... I'm assuming that's not your intention. You could maybe elaborate on that."

Crespo: "It's not a reduction at all. Again, it is classified as a... Class A misdemeanor. Currently, there... there... it's not being classified as anything. So, we're just creating a new classification. If there's an underlying crime that has a more severe penalty, Representative, that will supersede this... this particular crime or the misdemeanor."

Reboletti: "Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Crespo to close."

Crespo: "Well, I just ask for your 'aye' vote. This is something we worked really closely with the Attorney

61st Legislative Day

5/25/2007

General's Office, something that they've been wanting and asking for. So, I ask for your 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 115 voting 'yes' and 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, would you read Senate Bill 338."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 338, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. This is a second opportunity to vote to fix the glitch in the state's earned income tax credit. Under the interpretation of the Department of Revenue, the Bill that we adopted that gives people the refundability only is available to people who were eligible at some point for Temporary Assistance to Needy Families, the TANF program. That certainly wasn't the intent and the effect is that people similarly situated, some may get the credit and others may not get the credit, only because of their status as a potential member of the... of the group receiving TANF moneys. So, the parents of a disabled child who might once have been eligible for TANF do get the refundable part of the portion, but the same parents of a similar child will not if their eligibility was never established. So, all this measure does is to fix the glitch

61st Legislative Day

5/25/2007

and I hope you will join me a second time in voting 'yes' to make this correction."

Speaker Hannig: "Is there any discussion? Then the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Crespo, do you wish to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 115 voting 'yes' and 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 8 of the Calendar, under the Order of House Bills-Second Reading, is House Bill 1134. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 1134, a Bill for an Act concerning regional planning. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #4, offered by Representative Bassi, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Bassi."

Bassi: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen, House Amendment 4 finalizes the... the move that we made two (2) years ago to combine NIPC and CATS. They have become... were became originally the Regional Planning Authority. They are now going to be the Chicago Metropolitan Area for Planning. It provides the funding service, takes care of their Pension Code problem and adds a... an additional committee to take care of water waste issues. And I would ask for its adoption."

61st Legislative Day

- Speaker Hannig: "Is there any discussion? Then all in favor of the Amendment say 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it.

 And the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Committee Report from Rules."
- "Committee Reports. Representative Currie, Clerk Bolin: Chairperson from the Committee on Rules, to which the following legislative measures and/or Joint Action Motion were referred, action taken on May 25, 2007, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'direct floor consideration' for Amendment #2 to House Bill 765, Amendment #2 Senate Bill 19, Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 62, Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 108, Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 149, Amendment #4 to Senate Bill 244, Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 340, Amendment #1 Senate Bill 473, Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 526, Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 705, Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1245, Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1487; and a Motion to Table Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 1592."
- Speaker Hannig: "So, it's the intention of the Chair now to go to those... to those Bills where the Rules Committee has sent an Amendment directly to the floor. Okay. Actually, we have two (2) other items I have to deal with and then we're going to go to Second Readings. So, on the Order of House Bills... House Bills-Second Reading is House Bill 391. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 391, a Bill for an Act in relation to minors. Second Reading of this House Bill. Amendment #1

61st Legislative Day

- was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. And Mr. Clerk, read House Bill 396."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 396, a Bill for an Act concerning child welfare. Second Reading of this House Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. And Representative Turner, on Page 6 of the Calendar, we have House Bill 765. Do you wish us to read that? The Amendment is out of Rules. So, Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 765, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Second Reading of this House Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Turner, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Hannig: "Representative Turner. Representative Turner on the Amendment."
- Turner: "Thank you. Yeah. Amendment #1 creates the… I should say Amendment #2… 2 creates the Innocence Commission. It changes the name from the Innocence Commission to the Torture Commission."
- Speaker Hannig: "Is there any discussion? The Lady from Kane, Representative Lindner on the Amendment."
- Lindner: "Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
- Speaker Hannig: "He indicates he'll yield."
- Lindner: "Now, does this totally change the Bill then? Does this become the Bill?"

61st Legislative Day

5/25/2007

Turner: "It is a gut and replace."

Lindner: "Pardon?"

Turner: "It does change the Bill in a cou… a couple of places.

It does, in fact, make… provide changes within the legislation."

Lindner: "All right. But if you're changing it from an Innocence Commission to a Torture Commission and thi... this is... this is your Bill that created a task force for the Innocence Commission, right?"

Turner: "No, that's a different Bill, Representative."

Lindner: "Okay. But this now creates another commission, a Torture Commission?"

Turner: "That's correct. This was just recently brought to me.

This is... this is not the one... the other one that we spoke of before, no."

Lindner: "All right. I'd like to ask you, on page 22 there's a line, 'if the court finds in favor of the petitioner it shall enter an appropriate order with respect to the judgment or sentence in the former proceedings'. Does that mean if someone was found guilty that this judge could change the guilty... could change that and find the person not guilty?"

Turner: "Representative, if you'll repeat the question one more time, I'd appreciate it."

Lindner: "Well, on page 22 at the top. It's... the words say, 'if the court finds in favor of the petitioner it shall enter an appropriate order with respect to the judgment or sentence in the former proceedings and such supp... supplementary orders as to rearraignment, retrial, custody, bail, or

61st Legislative Day

- discharge, as may be necessary and proper'. So, does that mean there could've already been a trial and a judgment entered and does that mean now that this court, if there was torture found, that this court could vacate that former judgment, even if that person was guilty?"
- Turner: "The commission could recommend it. It does not automatically... Yeah. He would recommend. It would not... complete innos... no."
- Lindner: "But that... that's not what it says on page 22. It says that the court shall enter the appropriate order; it doesn't say anything about the commission. It says the court. Representative, maybe our staffs could talk to each other about this because it..."
- Turner: "Take the Bill out of the record and we'll come back to it."
- Lindner: "All right. Thank you."
- Speaker Hannig: "Okay. So, we'll take the Bill out of the record at this time. On Page 9 of the Calendar is House Bill 1322.

 Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1322, a Bill for an Act concerning children. Second Reading of this House Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Flowers, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Hannig: "Representative Flowers on the Amendment."
- Flowers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #2 would just empower the court to order the provisions to provert… to preserve family preservation. And I move for the adoption."

61st Legislative Day

- Speaker Hannig: "Is there any discussion? Then all in favor of the Amendment say 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it.

 And the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. We have Senate... House Amendments to Senate Bills that have come out of Rules directly to the floor and the Sponsors are: Reitz, Patterson, Harris, Saviano, Dugan, Mathias, Feigenholtz, Reboletti, Ryg, and Munson. So I would ask those people to be prepared as we move forward. So, the first Bill is on page 28 of the Calendar, and it's Senate Bill 19. So, Mr. Clerk, would you return that to the Order of Second Reading. And then, are there any Amendments?"
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 19, the Bill's been read a second time, previously. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Reitz, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Hannig: "Representative Reitz."
- Reitz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Amendment #2... or Floor Amendment #2 clarifies this Cord Blood Bank Bill for stem cells to make sure that hospitals are able to administer that and sign contracts with blood banks."
- Speaker Hannig: "Is there any discussion? Then all in favor of the Amendment say 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it.

 And the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. Representative Reboletti, you have an Amendment to Senate Bill 62. Mr. Clerk, read Senate Bill 62."

61st Legislative Day

5/25/2007

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 62, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Second Reading of this Senate Bill.

Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Reboletti, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Reboletti."

Reboletti: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. What this Amendment does is it states that minors... children in school cannot bring BB guns into the school. There's also language that states that if there are any BB guns or weapons that have to be brought to school for a play, for ROTC, for anything along those lines, that... as a prop, that that would be protected if the principal gave prior permission. As well, in there is that there was a situation, I believe in DeKalb County, where somebody brought an asp into the courtroom. A person could not be charged criminally. And this would also allow that to be a criminal charge."

Speaker Hannig: "Any discussion? Then all in favor of the Gentleman's Amendment say 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions filed."

Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read Senate Bill 108."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 108, a Bill for an Act in relation to children. The Bill has been read a second time, previously.

No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Harris, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Harris."

61st Legislative Day

- Harris: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members. This Amendment resolves some concerns that had been raised by the Cook County State's Attorneys Office and makes it an agreed Bill with the state's attorney."
- Speaker Hannig: "Is there any discussion? Then all in favor of the Gentleman's Amendment say 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read Senate Bill 108. I'm sorry, 149. Senate Bill 149."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 149, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. The Bill's been read a second time, previously.

 No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Saviano, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Hannig: "Representative Saviano."
- Saviano: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Floor Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 149 simply puts some cleanup language as it applies to the Electrologist Licensing Act. This is something that we needed to clean up. There's no opposition to it and I would ask that it be adopted."
- Speaker Hannig: "Is there any discussion? Then all in favor of the Gentleman's Amendment say 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read Senate Bill 244."

61st Legislative Day

- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 244, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #4, offered by Representative Dugan, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Hannig: "Representative Dugan on the Amendment."
- Dugan: "Thank you, Speaker. Floor Amendment #4 addresses some issues that were brought up. Of course, this particular Bill, Senate Bill 244, is the Health Facilities Planning Board legislation. And Floor Amendment #4 addresses a couple of concerns on the Senate side and also the House Minority Leader and I..."
- Speaker Hannig: "Is there any discussion? Then all in favor of the Lady's Amendment say 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read Senate Bill 340."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 340, a Bill for Act concerning aging.

 The Bill's been read a second time, previously. Amendment
 #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2, offered by
 Representative Mathias, has been approved for
 consideration."
- Speaker Hannig: "Representative Mathias."
- Mathias: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Floor Amendment 2 is an initiative of AARP and supported by the Department of Aging.

 It... what it does is it changes the appointment guidelines

61st Legislative Day

- for the Community Care Program Advisory Committee within the Department of Aging. And I ask for your 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Hannig: "Is there any discussion? Then all in favor of the Gentleman's Amendment say 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read Senate Bill 473."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 473, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. The Bill's been read a second time, previously. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Feigenholtz, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Hannig: "Representative Feigenholtz on the Amendment."
- Feigenholtz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Floor Amendment #1 is the same legislation as the Bill that passed out of here unanimously. Essentially, what it did was it allowed people to pay their property taxes on a credit card."
- Speaker Hannig: "Any discussion? Then all in favor of the Amendment say 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments."
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read Senate Bill 526."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 526, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by

61st Legislative Day

- Representative Feigenholtz, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Hannig: "Representative Feigenholtz."
- Feigenholtz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Floor Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 526 cleans up language and removes opposition to the underlying Bill."
- Speaker Hannig: "Is there any discussion? Then all in favor of the Amendment say 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it.

 The Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Bolin: "Floor Amendment... Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Hamos, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Hannig: "Representative Hamos."
- Hamos: "Thank you. Ladies and Gentlemen, this is the Energy Efficient Building Code that we had already considered before. It passed by very large numbers. It got stuck in the Senate. We're combining it with the Solar Building Bill. It makes sense to do both in the same Bill. And again, just to remind everybody this is an area... this an era of high electric rates. Energy efficiency is still the really effective way to go. It's effective strategy and I am urging an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Hannig: "Is there any discussion? Then all in favor of the Amendment say 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it.

 The Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read Senate Bill 705."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 705, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. The

61st Legislative Day

- Bill's been read a second time, previously. Floor Amendment #1 has been adopted. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Reboletti, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Hannig: "So Representative Reboletti on the Amendment."
- Reboletti: "This Amendment creates a new offense of unauthorized possession of a prescription form. It makes it a Class IV felony."
- Speaker Hannig: "Is there any discussion? Then all in favor of the Amendment say 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it.

 The Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read Senate Bill 1245."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1245, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. The Bill's been read a second time, previously. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Ryg, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Hannig: "Representative Ryg."
- Ryg: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Amendment 1 reflects negotiated language between the Autism Society of Illinois and the Department of Human Services regarding inspections of facilities under the jurisdiction of the department."
- Speaker Hannig: "Is there any discussion? Then all in favor of the Amendment say 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it.

 And the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

 Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions filed."

61st Legislative Day

- Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read Senate Bill 1487."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1487, a Bill for an Act concerning insurance. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Munson, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Hannig: "So, Mr. Clerk, we're going to have to return this Bill from Third Reading to Second Reading. And now, are there any Amendments?"
- Clerk Bolin: "Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Munson."
- Speaker Hannig: "Representative Munson."
- Munson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Floor Amendment #1 becomes the Bill and creates the Identity Protection Act. It's similar to legislation that passed out of here unanimously, but addresses some of the Senate concerns."
- Speaker Hannig: "Is there any discussion? Then all in favor of the Amendment say 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. So, we're going to continue on Second Readings... Senate Bills-Second Reading. So, I'll go down the list on page 38 and we'll skip those where we're aware that Amendments are pending or there are notes that are outstanding. So... so, Senate Bill 8 by Representative Chapa LaVia. Do you wish us to read that Bill on Second? ...wish us to read it or do you have Amendments pending? Do

61st Legislative Day

- you know? Did you wish us to read it, Representative? Okay. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 8, a Bill for an Act concerning veterans. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. Representative Stephens, you have Senate Bill 82. Shall we read that Bill? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 82, a Bill for an Act in relation to veterans. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. Representative Riley, on Senate Bill 115. Do you wish us to read the Bill? Shall we read it? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 115, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. Representative Mathias, on Senate Bill." Senate Bill 137. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 137, a Bill for an Act concerning the Internet. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. Representative Brosnahan, on Senate Bill 143. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 143, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No

61st Legislative Day

5/25/2007

Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."

Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. Representative Fritchey, on Senate Bill 171. Out of the record. Representative Osmond, on Senate Bill 184. No. Okay. Representative Verschoore, Bill Senate 262. Okay. Representative Representative Golar, on Senate Bill 307. Do you wish us to Representative Lyons, on Senate Bill 314. read the Bill? Okay. Out of the record. Representative Lang, you have Senate Bill 392. Shall we read that Bill? Out of the record. Representative Franks, on Senate Bill 509. Shall we read that Bill? Out of the record. Representative Chapa Senate Bill 597. of the LaVia, on Out Representative Rose, on Senate Bill 607. Do you wish us to read the Bill? Representative Rose, do you wish us to read this Bill on Second? Out of the record. Mr. Clerk, can we move Senate Bill 627? Are all the notes been compiled? Well, let's move that... that's been read a second time, previously. Let's so... so, let's move it to Third Reading. Senate Bill 680. Representative Osmond. Should we move that to Third? No? Do you wish this to go to Third Reading?"

Osmond: "Yes."

Speaker Hannig: "Yes. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 680, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Osmond, has been approved for consideration." Speaker Hannig: "Representative Osmond."

61st Legislative Day

- Osmond: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is an agreed Bill… agreed

 Amendment for all parties concerned, straightening out some
 language."
- Speaker Hannig: "Is there any discussion? Then all in favor say 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. Representative Krause, let's see... I be... Mr. Clerk, are there Amendments filed on Senate Bill 689? I'm sorry. Are the notes filed? So, the Clerk indicates the notes are not filed, so that will remain on Second. Representative Golar, on Senate Bill 697. Out of the record. Representative... Representative Turner, you have Senate Bill 753. Do you wish us to read that Bill? Is the Am... Okay. I'm... or out of the record? Okay. Okay. Mr. Clerk, read... read Senate Bill 573."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 573, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. Mr... Mr. Clerk, read Senate Bill 360."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 360, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. Representative Black, you have Senate Bill 853. Do you wish us to call that on Second?

 Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

61st Legislative Day

- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 853, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. Representative Hassert, on Senate Bill 1005. Out of the record. Mr. Clerk, could you advise us if the notes have been filed on Senate Bill 1007?" Clerk Bolin: "Notes are still pending on Senate Bill 1007."
- Speaker Hannig: "Okay. So, we'll have to hold that, Representative Osterman. Representative Miller, on Senate Bill 1169. Do you wish us to read that Bill? Do you wish us to read the Bill? Out of the record. Okay. Mr. Clerk, read Senate Bill 1169."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1169, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. Representative Durkin, on Senate Bill 1201. Out of the record. Representative Chapa LaVia, on Senate Bill 1243. You wish us to read this Bill? Okay. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1243, a Bill for an Act concerning environmental protection. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. Rep... Okay. So, Mr. Clerk, read Senate Bill 1005."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1005, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No

61st Legislative Day

5/25/2007

- Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. Representative Mautino, on Senate Bill 1261. You wish us to read that Bill? Representative Mautino. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1261, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Senate Bill 1261, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendments 1 and 2 have been approved for consideration. Floor Amendment #1, offered by... Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Mautino, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Hannig: "I'm advised you wish to table that Amendment, Representative. Is that correct?"

Mautino: "Correct."

- Speaker Hannig: "Withdraw the Amendment? Okay. So, the Gentleman withdraws Amendment #1. And now on Amendment #2, Representative Mautino."
- Mautino: "Thank you. I was just getting my computer set up here. Amendment #2 provides that the preliminary evidence presented in each case must show that a temporary collector should be appointed before the board and shall be allowed to do so. And this is the initiative of the Treasurer's Association and puts the Bill in its final form where it is now an agreed Bill. And be happy to answer any questions."
- Speaker Hannig: "Is there any discussion? Then all in favor of the Amendment say 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it.

 The Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "No further Amendments. No Motions filed."

61st Legislative Day

- Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. Representative Jefferson, on Senate Bill 1290. You wish us to read that Bill? Out of the record. Representative Hoffman, on Senate Bill 1265. Read the Bill Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 1265, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. Representative Watson, on Senate Bill 1360. Out of the record. Representative... Representative Hernandez, on Senate Bill 1428. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 1428, a Bill for an Act concerning children. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. Representative Lou Lang, on Senate Bill 1621. Out of the record. And Representative Monique Davis, on Senate Bill 1674. Do you wish us to read that? Okay. Out of the record. And Representative Chapa LaVia, on Senate Bill 1729. Representative Chapa LaVia. Okay. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 1729, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. All notes have been filed."
- Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. On page 33 of the Calendar, under the Order of Senate Bills-Third Reading, is Senate Bill 765. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

61st Legislative Day

5/25/2007

Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 765, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Ryg."

Ryg: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. On June 22, 1999, the United States Supreme Court decided declaring that the Olmstead case, the unnecessary segregation of individuals with disabilities in institutions may constitute discrimination based on disability. Supreme Court also held that states need to maintain a range of facilities for the care and treatment of individuals with diverse disabilities. The <u>Olmstead</u> decision calls implementation strategies to comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act integration mandate. Services are to be provided in the most integrated setting appropriate to the needs of people with mental or physical disabilities. Many of us have responded to our constituents' requests to provide people with disabilities and seniors with real choice in long-term care by pledging to support plans for Illinois to implement the Olmstead decision. For too long, we have failed our seniors and persons with disabilities by failing to fund home and community-based services. That is why this Bill is so significant as a first real step to rebalance our investments in serving the needs of Illinois citizens who count on these services. Senate Bill 765 creates the Money Follows the Person Implementation Act. The purpose of the Act is to codify and reinforce the state's commitment to promote individual choice. Ιt requires the Departments of Human Services, Aging, Children and Family Services, Public Health, and Healthcare and

61st Legislative Day

5/25/2007

Family Services to identify and reduce barriers to enable individuals to receive support for appropriate and necessary long-term care services in the setting of their choice. Through the Money Follows the Person Demonstration Grant, the state will capture \$55.7 million (\$55,700,000) transition an additional three thousand three hundred and fifty-seven (3,357) older persons and persons developmental, physical, or psychiatric disabilities from institutional settings to home and community-based services of their choice. Over five (5) years these efforts will result in increased state spending on the community end of the continuum of services increasing the percentage of state investment from 28.5 in 2006 to 37 percent by 2011. the receipt of this grant is what made it possible to get agreement from all stakeholders on this Bill, it does not diminish the fact that we will now have legislation that truly reflects our shared belief and passion for providing true choice for seniors and persons with disabilities by backing our words with dollars. There are many people to thank for this success: Senator Maggie Crotty, my colleague, and all the staff for their participation in long hours of negotiation. But it is through the determination and leadership of Ann Ford of the Illinois Network of Centers for Independent Living that we will have legislation that moves Illinois forward in providing choices of home and seniors community-based care for and persons disabilities. I'm honored to support all the efforts of all those who have contributed to this Bill and I ask that you

61st Legislative Day

5/25/2007

please join me and them in taking this important first step by voting 'aye'."

Speaker Hannig: "And on that question, the Gentle... the Lady from Cook, Representative Flowers."

Flowers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Lady yield?"

Speaker Hannig: "Indicates she'll yield."

Flowers: "Representative, is this similar to the Olmstead Act?"

Ryg: "This is funding that sets us in the right direction for implementation of the Olmstead Act."

Flowers: "Okay. I want to commend you for this legislation.

Last night on CNN News, it talked about... there was a special on in regards to patient dumping and how this elderly lady was dumped on the streets because she was mentally ill. And if the funding followed the patient she wouldn't have been dumped on Skid Row. So once again, I want to commend you for bringing forth this type of legislation."

Ryg: "Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Durkin."

Durkin: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Hannig: "Indicates she'll yield."

Durkin: "Representative Ryg, what type of impact will this legislation have on Little City or Misericordia?"

Ryg: "None. Unless they have residents who would choose to leave those facilities for different community-based care."

Durkin: "A CILA, correct?"

Ryg: "Yes."

Durkin: "Is there an incentive to move from those types of homes to a CILA, within this legislation?"

61st Legislative Day

5/25/2007

Ryg: "If the resident would choose to do that, then they would be able to take advantage of this Money Follows the Person Program. The state will get an enhanced federal match for those people to be funded in home and community-based services. This does not take any money away from any existing services or facilities."

Durkin: "Okay. Have... I'm... I'm just curious. Have you had any discussions or any feedback from those, you know, the Misericordias or Little Cities or associations like that?"

Ryg: "Yes, I have."

Durkin: "And their response has been?"

Ryg: "They understand that this takes nothing away from them and truly invests in the community and home based care that persons will choose when they're able to be served in those settings."

Durkin: "Okay. Thank you very much."

Speaker Hannig: "One in support and two in response.

Representative Black, you're recognized for 5 minutes."

Black: "Just for a question, Speaker. Thank you. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Hannig: "Indicates she'll yield."

Black: "Representative, I have no philosophical differences of any kind with the Bill, but let me just ask you a real world question. And this has come up before. We're dealing with a state that historically pays late. If somebody wants to move to a less restrictive environment and they show up, the institution that they're leaving may be owed three (3) months of reimbursement from the state, the CILA or any other facility that they want to move to, often... at least

61st Legislative Day

5/25/2007

this is what I was told the last time we discussed this. What about payment arrangements? And how are we going to make sure these people don't fall between the cracks, because the facility they're leaving may be owed three (3) and even four (4) months of reimbursement, the facility that they're going to may want some guarantee of payment. The individual often doesn't have that guarantee, so what would happen in a case like that because it's actually going on, as I'm sure you're aware as much as I am. How would that person..."

Ryg: "I'm sorry. What's going on, I missed... something is already going on. In terms of the transitioning?"

Black: "Sure."

Ryg: "Yes."

Black: "You're... you're transitioning from a facility that is owed money. You're trying to transition into a less restrictive environment, they want some guarantee of payment and if that comes from state funds, even though we'll get additional federal funding, how do they deal with that lag time?"

Ryg: "Th... this proposal provides a demonstration grant to the state. So there will be all the agencies that are involved will develop an interagency agreement of how they will process the... the transition from a more restrictive setting to a community-based setting."

Black: "Okay."

Ryg: "So that is part of the department's charge to develop those rules and procedures to ensure that the funding is available. What this grant allows us to do, though, is have

61st Legislative Day

5/25/2007

a pool that is not in the existing silos of individual agencies. This offers the flexibi... a flexibility and will give us the experience, so that going forward we will have a process in place where the concerns that you share won't... they will be able to be addressed by a funding mechanism..."

Black: "Okay."

Ryg: "...that is developed to provide the transition."

Black: "All right. That's what I..."

Ryg: "So that the money truly is available to people..."

Black: "That's what I..."

Ryg: "...as they leave."

Black: "That's what I... all I wanted was to make sure that we aren't going to get into some of the difficulties we've run into before and that is, yeah, the money will follow you but it may take six (6) months to catch up with you, and that often put people at risk. So, if you've worked that out, I appreciate that. So..."

Ryg: "That's..."

Black: "All right. Thank you."

Ryg: "...part of this grant, because currently we don't have a mechanism by which..."

Black: "Right."

Ryg: "...money truly follows a person."

Black: "Right. Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "We've had one in support and three (3) in response, the rules provide for two additional speakers in support. So, Representative Bellock, are you in support? Okay. So, you're recognized for 5 minutes."

61st Legislative Day

5/25/2007

Bellock: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I'm standing to support this Bill today because this is something that we have all worked on for probably at least the last eight (8) or ten (10) years to be able take people out of institutions and put them into the least restrictive environment that they can possibly be in to have a better quality of life. This is a wonderful thing that we're being able to get this money from the Federal Government with the match and it is something that we have looked forward to. Right now, in the State of Illinois, if you're in an institution for mental... mentally ill, that is close to a hundred and fifty thousand dollars (\$150,000) a year. If you're disabled, it's close to a hundred and thirty thousand dollars (\$130,000) a year. If those people could have a better quality of life and be in a CILA, in a four-bed home or whatever is the least restrictive environment for them, as long as this Bill allows for other groups to have choice, such as groups such as Misericordia, I'm in full support of this Bill and think that this is something that we should all be in supportive today because this is what we have been working towards for the last ten (10) years at least. Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Riley, you have 5 minutes in support."

Riley: "Will the Sponsor please yield?"

Speaker Hannig: "Indicates she'll yield."

Riley: "Representative, I'm looking at the Bill analysis and one of the Sections in the analysis says 'the allocation of public funds for home and community-based services shall not have the effect of diminishing or reducing the quality of

61st Legislative Day

5/25/2007

services available to residents of long-term care facilities. Can you just elaborate on that, for the record?"

Ryg: "Yes. The concern previously, has been if money truly followed the person then there were winners and losers in terms of service providers. So, this new demonstration grant allows us access to an increased federal match so that there will be new moneys to support the investment in the home and community-based services. It takes nothing away from other services."

Riley: "I think that's very important to be emphasized. To the Bill. This is a great Bill. I think everyone should be concerned about choice for the developmentally disabled in general, and I stand in support of it. Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "So, we've had three (3) in support and three (3) in response. And so Representative Ryg, you're recognized to close."

Ryg: "Thank you. Once again, we have all been asked by our constituents to support this initiative and this is a very exciting opportunity for the State of Illinois to truly match the intent of all of us to allow true choice for people who need long-term care services to be able to choose programs based on their needs and their desires to live in their home and in the community. This is truly an opportunity that we have. It's a first step. We'll be back with more, I'm sure, in terms of a request to continue the investment in home-, and community-based services. But I do appreciate all the work that has gone into this and hope

61st Legislative Day

- that you can all join me in supporting this legislation. Thank you."
- Speaker Hannig: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Bradley, do you wish to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 115 voting 'yes' and 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 39 of the Calendar is Senate Bill 266. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 266, a Bill for an Act in relation to education. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read Senate Bill 521."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 521, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. Representative Flowers, you're...
 you're recognized for a Motion to suspend the posting requirements."
- Flowers: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. I would like to suspend the Motion...
 the requirements and have House Bill 311 heard on next
 Wednesday."
- Speaker Hannig: "The Lady's Motion. Is there any discussion?

 Then the Attendance Roll Call will be used and the Motion is

61st Legislative Day

5/25/2007

adopted and the posting rule is suspended. Representative Yarbrough, you're recognized for a Motion to suspend the posting requirements."

Yarbrough: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to suspend the requirements for a hearing for Wednesday morning at 8:30... 9:30."

Speaker Hannig: "9:30."

Yarbrough: "For the accountability committee... subcommittee of the Elementary & Secondary Education Committee."

Speaker Hannig: "Are there any objections? Representative Black."

Black: "Mr. Speaker, we were never asked about this. What's the purpose of the hearing?"

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Yarbrough."

Black: "Is it subject matter only."

Speaker Hannig: "You want to explain it again."

Yarbrough: "The hearing is a... it's an accountability hearing.

It's our organizational meeting."

Black: "All right. But is it subject matter only?"

Yarbrough: "Yes."

Black: "No substantive Bills? Fine."

Yarbrough: "That's... that's correct."

Black: "Okay. That's fine. Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "So, you heard the Lady's Motion. We'll use the Attendance Roll Call and the Motion will be adopted and the posting requirement is suspended. Mr. Clerk, read the Adjournment Resolution."

Clerk Mahoney: "House Joint Resolution 68.

61st Legislative Day

- RESOLVED, BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE NINETY-FIFTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, THE SENATE CONCURRING HEREIN, that when the two Houses adjourn on Friday, May 25, 2007, the House of Representatives stands adjourned until Monday, May 28, 2007 at 3:00 p.m.; and the Senate stands adjourned until Monday, May 28, 2007, at 4:00 p.m."
- Speaker Hannig: "Representative... Representative Currie moves for the adoption of the Adjournment Resolution. All in favor say 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Adjournment Resolution is adopted. Before everyone starts to walk off, jus... I want to advise the Democratic Members that's there going to be a caucus immediately after adjournment. So, there'll be a Democratic Caucus in Room 114 immediately after adjournment. Now, Mr. Clerk, read the Agreed Resolutions."
- Clerk Mahoney: "On the Order of Agreed Resolutions is House Resolution 464, offered by Representative Cross. House Resolution 465, offered by Representative Ramey. House Resolution 466, offered by Representative Ramey. House Resolution 468, offered by Representative Pihos. House Resolution 469, offered by Representative Phelps. House Resolution 470, offered by Representative Dunkin."
- Speaker Hannig: "Representative Currie moves for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. All in favor say 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Agreed Resolutions are adopted. Are there any announcements? Then Representative Currie moves that, allowing perfunctory... Excuse me. Representative Will Davis."

61st Legislative Day

- Davis, W.: "Just... just like to let the Members know if you're traveling up and down I-55 there are State Troopers positioned every ten (10) miles from Chicago to St. Louis. Please be advised."
- Speaker Hannig: "Any other announcements? Then Representative Currie moves that the... and allowing perfunctory time for the Clerk, that the House stands adjourned until Monday, May 28, at the hour of 3 p.m. All in favor say 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The Motion is adopted and the House stands adjourned."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Perfunctory Session will come to order. Referred to the House Committee on Rules is House Resolution 467, offered by Representative Brauer. Introduction and Reading of Senate Bills-First Reading. Senate Bill 796, offered by Representative Crespo, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Senate Bill 1011, offered by Representative Berrios, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Senate Bill 1014, offered by Representative Black, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Senate Bill 1042, offered by Representative Dunn, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. And Senate Bill 1173, offered by Representative Rita, a Bill for Act an concerning transportation. This has been the introduction and First Reading of these Senate Bills. There being no further business, the House Perfunctory Session will stand adjourned."